



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/509,408	09/23/2004	Franciscus Lucas Antonius Johannes Kamperman	NL 020246	8026
24737 7590 06/25/2008 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				
EXAMINER DEBNATH, SUMAN				
ART UNIT 2135		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 06/25/2008		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/509,408

Applicant(s)

KAMPERMAN ET AL.

Examiner

SUMAN DEBNATH

Art Unit

2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2004.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 September 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 06/20/2005
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-26 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 4-12, 15-20, 22-23 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Moskowitz et al. (WO 01/18628 A2) (hereinafter "Moskowitz").

4. As to claim 1, Moskowitz discloses a method of enabling revocation or authorization of screened content material (100') screened by a screening device (103) or a screening application (103), the method comprising the step of: attaching or relating a unique screening device or application identifier (105) to content material (100) during import of the content material (100) from a non-compliant domain (101) into a compliant domain (102) (col. 11, lines 14-22, page 13, lines 4-11, page 17, lines 30-32 - page 18, lines 1-2), where the identifier (105) uniquely identifies the screening device (103) or the screening application (103) used to import said content material (100) (page 13, lines 9-11, page 11, lines 14-15).

5. As to claims 12, 22 and 23, these are rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 1.

6. As to claim 4, Moskowitz discloses characterized in that the method further comprises the steps of: generating and/or maintaining an authorization list (106) comprising a unique identifier (105) for at least one screening device or application (103) that has been granted authorization to import content material (100) into the compliant domain (102), and checking in a use device or application (104) prior to use of a screened content material (100') whether said attached or related unique screening device or application identifier (105) of a content material (100) exists in said authorization list (106), and disable use of the content material (100') if this is not the case (page 22, lines 8-15 and page 23, lines 12-16).

7. As to claims 15 and 25, these are rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 4.

8. As to claim 5, Moskowitz discloses characterized in that the step of attaching or relating said unique identifier (105) comprises: obtaining screening information, obtaining additional information being dependent on at least part the content material (100), and digitally signing the screening information and additional information, resulting in a digital signature, that uniquely identifies the screening device (103) or application (103) used to import said content material (100) (page 16, lines 5-11).

9. As to claim 16, it is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 5.

10. As to claim 6, Moskowitz discloses characterized in that said additional information comprises a result of a hash function performed on at least a part of said content material (100) (page 13, lines 24-27, page 16, lines 5-11).

11. As to claim 7, Moskowitz discloses characterized in that said additional information comprises a result of a digital fingerprint function performed on at least a part of said content material (100) (page 13, lines 4-6).

12. As to claim 17, it is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claims 6 and 7.

13. As to claim 8, Moskowitz discloses characterized in that the method further comprises one or more steps of: checking said content material (100') for the existence of said screening and additional information, and checking for a correct digital signature over said screening information, where the steps of checking are performed prior to use of the content material (100') by a use device or application (104), and where said use is prevented if at least one check is not met (page 16, lines 5-11).

14. As to claim 18, it is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 8.

15. As to claim 9, Moskowitz discloses characterized in that said unique identifier (105) comprises at least a public key of a screening device (103) or screening application (103), which is signed by a trusted authority (page 13, lines 24-27).

16. As to claim 19, it is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 9.
17. As to claim 10, Moskowitz discloses characterized in that a unique identifier (105) of a recording device (104) is attached or related to a copy of the screened content material (100') when the content material is recorded after import into the compliant domain (102) (page 13, lines 4-11).
18. As to claim 20, it is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 10.
19. As to claim 11, Moskowitz discloses characterized in that said additional information includes: a representation of a time-stamp, and that a use of said screened content (100') is disabled only if said time-stamp is after a time-stamp of the entry of said unique screening device or screening application identifier (105) in an authorization list (106), or after a time-stamp of the entry of said unique screening device or screening application identifier (105) in a revocation list (106) (page 16, lines 5-11).
20. As to claim 26, Moskowitz discloses a computer readable medium having stored thereon instructions for causing one or more processing units to execute the method according to claim 1 (page 3, lines 5-16).
21. Claims 1, 12 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ichlmura et al. (EP 0813194 A2) (hereinafter "Ichlmura").

22. As to claim 1, Ichlmura discloses a method of enabling revocation or authorization of screened content material (100) screened by a screening device (103) or a screening application (103), the method comprising the step of: attaching or relating a unique screening device or application identifier (105) to content material (100) during import of the content material (100) from a non-compliant domain (101) into a compliant domain (102) (col. 15, lines 38-49, col. 16, lines 19-33, col. 20, lines 14-20), where the identifier (105) uniquely identifies the screening device (103) or the screening application (103) used to import said content material (100) (col. 28, lines 34-43).

23. As to claims 12, 22 and 23, these are rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

24. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

25. Claims 2-3, 13-14, 21 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moskowitz and further in view of Safadi (Pub. No.: US 2002/0146237 A1).

26. As to claim 2, Moskowitz doesn't explicitly disclose said method further comprises the step of generating and/or maintaining a revocation list (106) comprising a unique identifier (105) for at least one screening device or application (103) that has been determined to illegally import content

material (100) into the compliant domain (102). However, Safadi discloses said method further comprises the step of generating and/or maintaining a revocation list (106) comprising a unique identifier (105) for at least one screening device or application (103) that has been determined to illegally import content material (100) into the compliant domain (102) ([0039], lines 8-19).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Moskowitz as taught by Safadi in order to increase security on copyright-protect content and "limiting the distribution and further playback of the copyright protected content (Safadi, [0008])".

27. As to claims 13 and 24, these are rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 2.

28. As to claim 3, Moskowitz doesn't explicitly disclose characterized in that the method further comprises the step of checking in a use device or application (104) prior to use of a screened content material (100') whether said attached or related unique screening device or application identifier (105) exists in said revocation list (106), and disable the use of the screened content material (100') if this is the case. However, Safadi discloses characterized in that the method further comprises the step of checking in a use device or application (104) prior to use of a screened content material (100') whether said attached or related unique screening device or application identifier (105) exists in said revocation list (106), and disable the use of the screened content material (100') if this is the case ([0039], lines 8-19).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Moskowitz as taught by Safadi in order to increase security on copyright-protect content and "limiting the distribution and further playback of the copyright protected content (Safadi, [0008])".

29. As to claim 14, it is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 3.

30. As to claim 21, it is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 11.

31. Examiner's note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the Applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may be applied as well. It is respectfully requested from the Applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Conclusion

32. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SUMAN DEBNATH whose telephone number is (571)270-1256. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y. Vu can be reached on 571 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. D./
Examiner, Art Unit 2135

/KimYen Vu/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2135